

Boundary unitarity without firewalls

Ted Jacobson

*Maryland Center for Fundamental Physics
Department of Physics, University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742-4111, USA*

Abstract

Both AdS/CFT duality and more general reasoning from quantum gravity point to a rich collection of boundary observables that always evolve unitarily. The physical quantum gravity states described by these observables must be solutions of the spatial diffeomorphism and Wheeler-deWitt constraints, which implies that the state space does not factorize into a tensor product of localized degrees of freedom. The recent “firewall” argument that unitarity of black hole S-matrix implies the presence of a highly excited quantum state near the horizon is based on such a factorization, hence is not applicable in quantum gravity.

A rash of black hole arson has recently consumed many bits of information at arxiv.org and elsewhere. The motivation of the original perpetrators (AMPS)[1] (who have made no effort to conceal their identity) is to uphold the unitarity of the black hole S-matrix at any cost, even if that entails surrounding the black hole by a wall of fire. That extreme measure appears inevitable if one assumes both that (1) there is a unitary S-matrix describing evolution from a pure state of infalling matter to outgoing Hawking radiation, and (2) low energy effective quantum field theory in the black hole background holds to a good approximation beyond some microscopic distance from the horizon. As of this writing there are 25 papers citing Ref. [1], most arguing for or against the inevitability of firewalls. Of these, two [2, 3] seem to have some overlap with the gravitational viewpoint taken here, but I don’t claim to fully understand or endorse everything in those papers. A third [4] approaches the question from the boundary CFT side, and its viewpoint is dual to the one taken here.

The AMPS reasoning begins with the fact that the ground state of a quantum field near a black hole is known in low energy effective field theory on the black hole background to be a superposition of maximally entangled pairs, with one member of the pair localized outside the horizon and the other one inside. Any significant deviation from this structure would imply that the state is actually not the local ground state but is excited, and the energy density in that excited state would grow exponentially as it is followed backwards in time toward the horizon. Hence if there is to be a regular horizon, there is not much leeway in the outgoing vacuum near the horizon. This situation is similar to the one in primordial cosmology, which implies that the quantum state during a period of inflationary exponential expansion of the scale factor must essentially be the de Sitter vacuum, since otherwise at earlier times the energy density of excitations would have overwhelmed the uniform vacuum energy driving the inflation in the first place.

Now the basic idea of the AMPS argument is that for the collection of all the Hawking radiation to be in a pure quantum state, despite initially emerging in a mixed, thermal state, it must be that around halfway through the evaporation, *at the latest*, emerging Hawking quanta are entangled, at least somewhat, with earlier Hawking radiation. Such entanglement would imply that those later quanta are not maximally entangled with their partners inside the horizon however, which would mean that the field is not in the local ground state, and therefore that there must be a firewall just outside the horizon.

The firewall conclusion seems highly implausible, basically since a weak quantum gravity effect should not have a huge back reaction on a macroscopic object. To avoid this conclusion, assuming the validity of the AMPS argument, one must find a reason to reject at least one of the assumptions. For the same reason as the firewall is implausible, the semi-classicality assumption (2) seems highly plausible, and the unitarity assumption (1) seems at first highly implausible, since information about what falls into a black hole can apparently be lost forever to the outside.

However, simply rejecting assumption (1) is too facile an escape from the firewall. Many arguments have been advanced arguing that black hole evaporation is in fact unitary as viewed just from the outside. In my view almost none of those are convincing. For example, it is oft stated that if information could be lost inside black holes then the principles of quantum mechanics would be violated leading to a breakdown in the theory, or that the black hole pair creation rate would be far too large, or that rampant

violations of energy and momentum conservation would occur in the vacuum. Putting aside all such unconvincing arguments however, there is nevertheless a powerful argument in favor of black hole unitarity coming from AdS/CFT duality. The argument is simply that the CFT is a UV complete quantum field theory on a fixed background manifold, hence is “manifestly” unitary. At the same time, the CFT is presumably dual to at least enough of the gravity/string theory in the AdS bulk to capture all asymptotic observables in the theory, such as those associated with the black hole S-matrix.

Even if the AdS/CFT argument held only in that specific setting, it would be enough to consider the AMPS question. But in fact Marolf [5] has argued that the essential reason for the AdS/CFT result carries over more generally to any diffeomorphism invariant theory with an asymptotic region in which an algebra of observables can be defined. His point is that in such a theory, the Hamiltonian is a surface integral in the asymptotic region, which I will call “the boundary”. More precisely, the Hamiltonian also contains a volume integral of combinations of the diffeomorphism constraints, but those act trivially¹ on any physical state in the Hilbert space (according to Dirac quantization of a constrained system). Hence the algebra of boundary observables evolves unitarily in time into itself, and this means that no boundary information can ever be lost. In the asymptotically flat case, the boundary algebra would have to be located at null infinity or perhaps at spacelike infinity [6] (rather than at the point at spacelike infinity i^0) if a nontrivial notion of time evolution were to be present. Although the details have not been worked out, this generalization of the idea of boundary unitarity is at least plausible. For the present discussion I will assume its validity, but if necessary the arguments could be restricted to the AdS setting.

Now let’s consider the implications of this boundary unitarity. Note first that it implies that *boundary information is never lost, not even temporarily*. This is quite unlike the situation considered by AMPS. They contemplate a process in which a certain amount of early time Hawking radiation arrives, far from the black hole, in a mixed quantum state, and therefore needs to be purified later by the late time Hawking radiation, in order that, in the end, the final out-state will be unitarily related to the in-state. Boundary unitarity would never allow such a scenario if the Hawking quanta arrive at the boundary, and it has nothing to say about them if they do *not* arrive at

¹Actually it might just be that matrix elements of the constraints between physical states vanish, but that is probably good enough to make the argument.

the boundary. Hence I will assume they do arrive at the boundary.

Boundary unitarity then means that when outgoing Hawking quanta arrive at the boundary, they arrive “together with their entangled partners”, so to speak. That is, both a Hawking quantum and the degrees of freedom with which it is entangled – whatever they are – are described within the boundary algebra. This much seems obvious and inevitable in AdS/CFT and, more generally according to Marolf’s argument, in any diffeomorphism invariant theory. For this reason I think that the AMPS assumption (1) is unmotivated and should be replaced by the different assumption (1b) of boundary unitarity. That is, the question that should be considered is not whether the Hawking radiation can manage to be self-purifying in the end without engendering a firewall, but whether it can be *continuously pure* when taken together with the rest of the asymptotically observable physical state space.

It might appear that the AMPS argument carries over to assumption (1b), because continuous purity seems to require that a Hawking quantum be entangled with exterior degrees of freedom, so that it could not be maximally entangled with its partner behind the horizon. According to the AMPS reasoning this would require a firewall right from the beginning of the Hawking emission. But there is a deeper aspect of the change from assumption (1) to (1b). Namely, (1b) refers only to gauge-invariant states in the physical quantum gravity Hilbert space, which are annihilated by the diffeomorphism constraints (spatial diffeomorphism invariance and the Wheeler-de Witt equation), whereas (1) refers to an approximate concept of quantum field theory states in a background geometry, and assumes the Hilbert space is a tensor product of exterior and interior state spaces. But this factorization is certainly not a feature of the physical Hilbert space of quantum gravity states. The representative of the Hawking quantum’s partner at the boundary is *not* another factor of the Hilbert space. In fact, the “partner behind the horizon” is a fictional character in full quantum gravity, which on account of diffeomorphism invariance has no such localizable degrees of freedom.

So how then is the partner, i.e. the purifier of a Hawking quantum, encoded at the boundary? I suppose it must be in the gravitational imprinting of the quantum fluctuation that corresponds to each particular realization of the Hawking process. This imprinting is conveyed via the diffeomorphism constraints (in particular the Wheeler-de Witt equation), and reaches to infinity. If interior information were *copied* onto another factor in the Hilbert space, this cloning of quantum information would violate the linearity of

quantum mechanics [7]. But this gravitational imprinting is not a duplication of information because, modulo the constraints, the Hilbert space is not a tensor product of interior and exterior degrees of freedom, and the independent observables are fewer in number than semiclassical reasoning leads us to believe [8, 4].

To illustrate how the quantum mechanics can work in this way it is helpful to consider a simple model consisting of spins. Suppose the system consists of four spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ degrees of freedom, for which the usual Hilbert space $\frac{1}{2} \otimes \frac{1}{2} \otimes \frac{1}{2} \otimes \frac{1}{2}$ would be $2^4 = 16$ dimensional. To model the diffeomorphism constraint, let us add the requirement that the “physical” states consist only of the singlets, i.e. the states with vanishing total angular momentum. To find the singlets we can decompose the unconstrained tensor product Hilbert space into irreducible spin representations:

$$(\tfrac{1}{2} \otimes \tfrac{1}{2}) \otimes (\tfrac{1}{2} \otimes \tfrac{1}{2}) = (0 \oplus 1) \otimes (0 \oplus 1) = 0 \oplus 1 \oplus 1 \oplus (1 \otimes 1).$$

The last term is equal to $0 \oplus 1 \oplus 2$, so there are two singlets. The singlet subspace is not a tensor product. Moreover, although these singlet states are collective in the original unconstrained degrees of freedom, they can be distinguished by observables that act only on a subspace of the unconstrained Hilbert space. For example, let $\mathbf{J}_1$ and $\mathbf{J}_2$ denote the angular momentum operators of the second pair. Then the eigenvalues of $(\mathbf{J}_1 + \mathbf{J}_2)^2$ are 0 and 1, which label the first and second singlets respectively. The same kind of measurement could have been made instead on the first pair, or even on a different pairing, and still it would serve to fully measure the state within the physical Hilbert space. We can add more spins to enrich the system, and the pattern persists. For example, the total unconstrained Hilbert space of six spins is $2^6 = 64$ dimensional, but the space of singlets is 5 dimensional, and these can be distinguished using the eigenvalues of the three commuting operators $\mathbf{J}_{12}^2$, $\mathbf{J}_{34}^2$, and $\mathbf{J}_{1234}^2$, where $\mathbf{J}_{12} = \mathbf{J}_1 + \mathbf{J}_2$, etc. For $2N$ spins, the dimension of the space of singlets is approximately $2^{2N}/N^{3/2}$ in the large N limit [9], which is smaller than the unconstrained dimension by the large factor $N^{3/2}$. In this spin model, there is just one constraint, while in the quantum gravity case there are four constraints per spatial point. This serves as a reminder of how different the physical state space is from the unconstrained Hilbert space.

The fact that the physical Hilbert space does not factorize into degrees of freedom inside and outside a horizon, and that the states have a global

nature, does not mean it is impossible to make measurements of effectively local degrees of freedom. One could lower a probe to a black hole horizon to interact with the “local” degrees of freedom. However, in this case, the full quantum state, including the “local” measuring device, must satisfy the diffeomorphism constraints, and the presence of the measuring device changes the nature of the physical states.

My story is obviously lacking in the essential details of exactly what is the nature of the physical states, and how the “partners” and more generally any other degrees of freedom we would semiclassically think of as residing behind the horizon are encoded in the boundary. In the AdS/CFT setting however, Ref. [4] proposes a concrete answer to this question, at least for the partners. That paper is in a sense dual to this one. Rather than invoking the constraints of bulk quantum gravity, the authors start from the CFT side and show how, associated with an approximately thermal but *pure* state, one can construct an algebra of operators corresponding to the partners behind a horizon in the hologram. Based on this construction, they are able to be rather precise about the sense in which the degrees of freedom are redundant with the exterior degrees of freedom.

In conclusion, when the logical structure of the quantum gravity theory is fully taken into account, the firewall paradox is resolved. In particular, the distinction between the field theory Hilbert space on a background spacetime and the physical state space is crucial for resolving the paradox. This should be expected, since only for physical states does the Hamiltonian reduce to a boundary term, and therefore only for such states do we have any reason to expect boundary unitarity to hold.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported in part by NSF grant PHY-0903572, and by the Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics through NSF grant PHY11-25915.

References

- [1] A. Almheiri, D. Marolf, J. Polchinski and J. Sully, “Black Holes: Complementarity or Firewalls?,” arXiv:1207.3123 [hep-th].

- [2] Y. Nomura, J. Varela and S. J. Weinberg, “Complementarity Endures: No Firewall for an Infalling Observer,” arXiv:1207.6626 [hep-th].
- [3] R. Brustein, “Origin of the blackhole information paradox,” arXiv:1209.2686 [hep-th].
- [4] K. Papadodimas and S. Raju, “An Infalling Observer in AdS/CFT,” arXiv:1211.6767 [hep-th].
- [5] D. Marolf, “Unitarity and Holography in Gravitational Physics,” Phys. Rev. D **79**, 044010 (2009) [arXiv:0808.2842 [gr-qc]].
- [6] A. Ashtekar and J.D. Romano, “Spatial infinity as a boundary of space-time,” Class. Quant. Grav. **9**, 1069 (1992).
- [7] W. K. Wootters and W. H. Zurek, “A single quantum cannot be cloned,” Nature **299**, 802 (1982).
- [8] S. B. Giddings, D. Marolf and J. B. Hartle, “Observables in effective gravity,” Phys. Rev. D **74**, 064018 (2006) [hep-th/0512200].
- [9] E. R. Livine and D. R. Terno, “Quantum black holes: Entropy and entanglement on the horizon,” Nucl. Phys. B **741**, 131 (2006) [gr-qc/0508085].